



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,362	06/27/2003	Akm Kamrul Alam	END920030036US1	8152
26502	7590	03/13/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION			VU, TUAN A	
IPLAW IQ0A/40-3			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1701 NORTH STREET			2193	
ENDICOTT, NY 13760			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/609,362	ALAM, AKM KAMRUL
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Tuan A. Vu	2193

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1.3-5 and 7-17.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Other: See IDS attached: Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The argument in regard to claim 1 against Crespo's 'workstation generation process' appears to be founded upon conveniently ignoring the weak connotation of the recited language such as 'supplying a prerequisite parameter' while installing or invoking another program; that is, there is no generation of prerequisite per se from any object during the very process by which the object is being installed. The prerequisite limitation seems irrelevant in terms of its (generation) source with respect to the object being generated, hence no direct relationship to this installation process. Crespo's previously generated response files to support creation of more applications are deemed sufficient to cover the language of the claims, absent from the claim tight relationship between prerequisites and the object being installed, because when a object is installed, it is well-known or standard that the object have some requirements to meet that make it appropriate for installation (i.e. claim 1: which currently have prerequisite parameters). The argument invoking the protection based on 35 USC 103c to invalidate any 103(a) rejection is deemed largely groundless. Again, arguments that Crespo's response files are not objects created by another object (while this is being installed) does not seem to consider how broad and unprecise the recital of 'prerequisite parameter' and 'program objects' has been set forth in claim 1. Against claim 9, applicants have submitted that Crespo does not test connectivity to database; but in light of the cited portions of Crespo, there are response files that indicate the status of a link to such database; and the limitation about testing is deemed mapped as set forth in the rejection. The claims and its language laid out with broad and undefined relationship between prerequisite and the object being installed stand rejected because they are not in condition for allowance, and the arguments are not yet convincing in many respects.(Note: the amendment to the Specifications will be entered).

Continuation of 13. Other: IDS filed 3/1/07: Notwithstanding the significance of CFR § 1.56 which amounts to an unrelated issue, the applicants are respectfully asked to refer to CFR § 1.98 (2) in order to see why the Examiner has no means to visually inspect the content of a what is required (to be a legible copy) of a IDS submitted document; hence the IDS document as above mentioned would stand non-considered (NC) because no legible copy has been submitted for visual consideration according to § 1.97 and 1.98.

  
03-12-07